

**Worksheet**  
**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)  
NEPA #: DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0017-DNA

---

**A. BLM Office:** Tucson Field Office

**Lease/Serial/Case File No.** N/A

**Project Title/Type:** Reymert Historic Townsite Driveway, Parking and Signing Plan

**Location of Proposed Action:** Public lands in the Middle Gila Canyons Travel Management Area, at and adjacent to the existing Reymert Historic Townsite cultural resource management area. Generally situated within T2S R11E Sec. 27 SE ¼ NW ¼, G&SR PM, Pinal County, AZ. Map 1 shows the location of the proposed action.

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Maintain designated primitive road clearance by removing, trimming and cutting encroaching vegetation, branches and limbs. Maintain parking turnouts along the designated site driveway. Physically close unauthorized driveways to prevent public motor vehicle use within the cultural resource management area (see Map 2). Install a steel metal locking gate, 12 ft width, with two lock system and locking box and gate information sign. Design the locking gate with a barrier free pedestrian passage. Maintain the unauthorized driveways for pedestrian paths, with one of the closed driveways to be used for administrative access to the Reymert Spring near the site (See Map 2). Install interpretive kiosk with information about the historic townsite, its significance in the area, and visitor use ethic and regulations. Delineate the perimeter of the parking turnouts with wheel or bumper stops to define the edge or boundary. All excavation (gate posts, kiosks posts, sign posts) will be monitored to ensure no hidden cultural resource values are uncovered. All vegetation trimming will be done with hand tools using proper pruning techniques. Clean out and obliterate the campsite within the cultural resource management area. Monitor the site periodically for compliance with use restrictions, resource conditions and visitor use.

**Applicant (if any):** BLM Recreation Management Program.

**B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans**

LUP Name*	<u>Phoenix RMP/EIS</u>	Date Approved	<u>Sep. 1989</u>
LUP Name*	<u></u>	Date Approved	<u></u>
Other document**	<u>Middle Gila Canyons TTMP EA</u>	Date Approved	<u>Nov. 10, 2011</u>

\*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

\*\*List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because **it is specifically** provided for in the following LUP decisions:

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though **it is not specifically** provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Comments:

*The LUP designated the Reymert Historic Townsite cultural resource management area. A cultural resource management area activity plan prepared in 1993 identifies access and parking areas, barriers and signing, and further work on the site. The vehicle barriers and signing are proposed for replacement and maintenance under the current proposed action.*

**C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

1. *Cultural Resource Project Plan for Reymert/DeNoon, EA# AZ-024-92-02; Decision Record Jan. 21, 1993.*
2. *Middle Gila Canyons Transportation and Travel Management Plan, EA# AZ-420-2007-01; Decision Record Nov. 10, 2010. This document identifies continued maintenance of the access road, signing, and OHV use restrictions that were identified in the original activity plan of 1993.*

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

1. *Middle Gila Roads Inventory 2008: Cultural Resources Inventory of 46 Miles of Existing Roads on BLM land East of Florence, Pinal County, Arizona, July 7, 2008 (Revised). This document identified new features associated with the Reymert Historic Townsite that lie outside the designated cultural resource management area. The activity plan will be updated or maintained to reflect this new information under a separate action.*

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

*Yes, the proposed action is the same as previously analyzed. Several site design configurations were considered with substantially the same features.*

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

*Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document is appropriated for the current proposed action. Site specific design alternatives were considered as well.*

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; inventory and monitoring data; most recent lists of endangered species listing; updated BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

*Yes, the existing analysis is valid in light of new information. The 2008 cultural resources inventory identified historic townsite features and produced a more accurate map than in the original planning documents. The new information would not change the analysis of the currently proposed action.*

**4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

*Yes, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts from the currently proposed action are similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.*

**5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

*Yes. Extensive public and interagency review was conducted for the Middle Gila Canyons TMP and EA. The current proposed action identifies site specific measures proposed to implement decisions in the TMP.*

**E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Resource/Agency Represented</u></b>
Francisco J. Mendoza,	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, Access, Transportation
Amy Sobiech,	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
Darrell Tersey	Natural Resource Specialist	Special Status Species
Kristen Duarte	Range Specialist	Grazing program
Albert Mezzano,	Park Ranger	Operations and Site Work
Travis McGill	Ranch Foreman	Len Ranch (Dos Vaqueros Volando)

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

## **DETERMINATION**

- ☒ Based on this review it is my determination that the proposed action is in conformance with the Phoenix Resource Management Plan (approved September 1989), as amended. The proposed action implements a decision previously made in the *Middle Gila Canyons Transportation and Travel management Plan, EA# AZ-420-2007-01, Decision Record approved November 10, 2010.*

The previous decision was analyzed for compliance with NEPA, and was subject to administrative procedures for protest and appeals to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR, Part 4 and the BLM Form 1842-1. No appeals were taken, and no petitions for a stay were filed, and therefore the decision is in force and effect.

The currently proposed action finalizes site specific details necessary for on-the ground work to implement the previous decision. The proposed action does not constitute a new or different decision, and may be carried out immediately subject to availability of labor and funds.

Note: If one or more of the DNA criteria are not met, a determination of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and the proposed action described above must undergo further NEPA review.

/s/ Francisco J. Mendoza  
Francisco J. Mendoza, Project Lead

/s/ Amy Markstein  
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Viola E. Hillman  
Signature of Responsible Official

02/19/2014  
Date

**Note:** The signed DETERMINATION on this Worksheet concludes the review of the currently proposed action for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.